

REMARKS

A review of the claims indicates that:

A) Claims 7, 8, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20, 24 and 33 remain in their original form.

B) Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 13, 14, 17 and 21—23 are currently amended.

C) Claims 2—4, 10, 11, 18 and 25—32 are currently cancelled.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims and withdrawal of the rejections.

Telephone Interview

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor for taking the time to interview this case. The Applicant feels that the interview advanced prosecution, and resolved some issues related to the claims and the prior art of record.

In particular, an agreement was made that Claims 1—3 would be combined, the "copying" language of block 306 of Fig. 3 would be substituted for the "adding" term of Claim 3, and that a phrase indicating that the root certificate was being copied "from the smartcard" would be added. Additionally, these amendments would be approximately replicated in other independent claims, as appropriate and practical.

Concerning the prior art, the Examiner appeared to agree that the prior art does not disclose, teach or suggest that a root certificate is read from the smartcard and written to a computing device attached to (interfaced to) the smartcard.

1 Instead, the prior art teaches that root certificates are retained in the smartcard(s)
2 and are operative within the smartcard.

3 The Examiner indicated that due to the clarification and greater
4 understanding of what the claims' recitations mean, a further search may be
5 required.

7 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

8 Claims 1—33 were rejected under §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S.
9 Patent Application No. 2002/0026578, hereinafter "Hamann." In response, the
10 Applicant respectfully submits that the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie*
11 case of anticipation and, in view of the comments below, respectfully traverses the
12 Office's rejections.

14 Traversal of Rejection of Independent Claim 1

15 **Claim 1** recites a method comprising:

- 16 • determining if a smartcard is operatively available, said smartcard
17 having smartcard memory;
- 18 • requiring entry of a password and authentication by the smartcard;
- 19 • identifying at least one root certificate stored in said smartcard
20 memory;
- 21 • reading said at least one root certificate from said smartcard
22 memory; and
- 23 • storing said at least one root certificate in a device operatively
24 coupled to said smartcard;
- 25 • wherein said device comprises a computing device having computer
memory, and wherein storing said at least one root certificate in said
device operatively coupled to said smartcard comprises **copying
said at least one root certificate from the smartcard to a
certificate store maintained in said computer memory.**

1 Claim 1 has been amended to recite, "copying said at least one root
2 certificate from the smartcard to a certificate store maintained in said computer
3 memory". The Applicant respectfully submits that the Hamann reference does not
4 disclose copying a root certificate from a smart card to a memory of a device
5 attached to the smartcard. The Applicant also respectfully submits that this point
6 was agreed upon in the interview; however, the Examiner indicated that a further
7 search would be required to confirm novelty and non-obviousness of this aspect.

8 Referring for example, to Hamann at paragraph [0005], Hamann discloses
9 that the smartcard is used to prevent export of such keys, and to allow signing
10 operations and other usage of cryptographic keys to be performed *inside* the
11 smartcard. Accordingly, Hamann teaches that keys are not removed from the
12 smartcard. For example, see the last two sentences of paragraph [0005], wherein
13 Hamann discloses that smartcards perform calculations inside the card and that
14 smartcards "do not provide any function to export the private key to the outside"
15 (Hamann, paragraph [0005], last sentence).

16 Hamann's paragraphs [0006], [0031] and [0032] all disclose operation of
17 one or more keys *within* the smartcard and do not disclose any means to remove a
18 key from the smartcard.

19 In the Examiner interview, the Examiner asked that Claim 1 be amended to
20 clarify that the root certificate was being copied "from the smartcard" and "to a
21 certificate store maintained in said computer memory" (of a device operatively
22 connected to the smartcard). This amendment has been made. Accordingly, the
23 Applicant respectfully submits that elements recited by Claim 1 are not disclosed
24 by the Hamann reference, and asks that Claim 1 be allowed to issue.
25

1
2 **Claims 5—8** depend from Claim 1 and are allowable due to their
3 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
4 their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are
5 not shown and not disclosed in references of record, either singly or in
6 combination with one another.

7
8 **Claims 9, 17, 21 and 23** are allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 1
9 is allowable, and the remarks/arguments from above are incorporated at this
10 location by reference. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
11 features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are not shown and not
12 disclosed in references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

13
14 **Claims 12—16, 19, 20, 22 and 24** depend from Claims 9, 17, 21 and 23,
15 and are allowable due to their dependence from an allowable base claim. These
16 claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with
17 those recited in their respective base claims, are not shown and not disclosed in
18 references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

19
20 **Status of Claim 33**

21 **Claim 33** does not appear to have rejected. The Applicant submits that it is
22 allowable, but welcomes the opportunity to discuss and prosecute this claim by
23 Examiner's amendment.
24
25

1 **Conclusion**

2 The Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance
3 and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued.

4 If the Office's next anticipated action is not the issuance of a Notice of
5 Allowability, the Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be
6 contacted for the purpose of scheduling an interview. Please call, and we can
7 discuss ways to advance the prosecution of this case.

8
9 Respectfully Submitted,

10
11 Dated: 24 June 2008

12 By: /David S. Thompson/
13 David S. Thompson
14 Reg. No. 37,954
15 Attorney for Applicant

16 LEE & HAYES PLLC
17 Suite 500
18 421 W. Riverside Avenue
19 Spokane, Washington 99201
20 Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
21 Facsimile: (509) 323-8979